Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED

08-607 NOV 3 - 2008

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

No. _____

In The
Supreme Court of the United States

FIDEL GONZALEZ,

Petitioner,

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Respondent.

On Petition for Writ of Certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

STEVEN JAY ROZAN
Counsel of Record
STEVEN JAY ROZAN & ASSOCIATES
2777 ALLEN PARKWAY, 10TH FLOOR
HOUSTON, TEXAS 77019
TEL: 713/627-3608
FAX: 713/622-8777

Attorney for Petitioner

November 3, 2008

Becker Gallagher · Cincinnati, OH · Washington, D.C. · 800.890.5001

QUESTION PRESENTED

I. Whether the provisions of the Sentencing Reform Act indicate that Congress did not intend that acquitted conduct should always be treated the same as convicted conduct.

II. Whether the Sentence in this case, which was significantly enhanced for acquitted conduct, is unreasonable because the District Court failed to Consider properly the statutory purposes in 18 U. S. C. § 3553(a).

PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDINGS

Petitioner, Fidel Gonzalez, was a criminal defendant in the United States District Court for the Middle District of Florida, Ft. Myers Division in USDC Case No.2:05-CR-119-FTM-29DNF and an Appellant in the United States Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit in USCA No. 07-13914-GG. Respondent, United States of America, was the plaintiff in the District Court and Appellee in the United States Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Question Presented i

Parties to the Proceedings ii

Table of Contents iii

Table of Authorities v

Petition for a Writ of Certiorari 1

Opinion Below 1

Statement of Jurisdiction 1

Constitutional and Statutory Provisions Involved 1

Statement of the Case 2

A. The Proceedings Below 2

B. The Factual Background 3

Reasons for Granting the Writ 8

I. The provisions of the Sentencing Reform Act indicate that Congress did not intend that acquitted conduct should always be treated the same as convicted conduct. 10

II. The Sentence in this case, which was significantly enhanced for acquitted conduct, is unreasonable because the District Court failed to Consider properly the statutory purposes in 18 U. S. C. § 3553(a). 21

Conclusion 22

Appendix

Appendix A – Opinion of the United States Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit filed on May 28, 2008 ..... 1a

Appendix B – Judgment in a Criminal Case, dated July 31, 2007 ..... 11a

Appendix C – Order of the United States Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit filed on August 4, 2008 ..... 21a

Appendix D – Superseding Indictment, dated June 29, 2006 ..... 23a

Appendix E – Constitutional Amendments and Statutes 29a

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES

Apprendi v. New Jersey,
530 U.S. 466 (2000) 9, 15

Blakely v. Washington,
542 U.S. 296 (2004) 9, 15

Ford v. United States, 273 U. S. 593 (1927) 15

Gall v. United States, 128 S. Ct. 586 (2007) 20

McMillan v. Pennsylvania, 477 U.S. 79 (1986) ... 8

Ring v. Arizona, 536 U.S. 584 (2002) 9

Rita v. United States, 127 S. Ct. 2456 (2007) 20

United States v. Booker,
543 U.S. 220 (2005) ..... *passim*

United States v. Coleman,
370 F. Supp. 2d 661 (S. D. Ohio 2005) 17

United States v. Concepcion,
983 F. 2d 369 (2d Cir. 1992) 18

United States v. Dazey,
403 F. 3d 1147 (10th Cir. 2005) 19

United States v. Eurer,
463 F. 3d 792 (7th Cir. 2006) 15

United States v. Faust,
456 F.3d 1342 (11th Cir. 2006) 9

United States v. Frias,
39 F. 3d 391 (2nd Cir. 1994) 17

United States v. Hunter,
19 F. 3d 895 (4th Cir. 1994) 18

United States v. Ibanga,
454 F. Supp. 2d 532 (E.D. Va. 2006) 9, 17

United States v. James,
478 U.S. 597 (1986) 15

United States v. Johnson,
323 U.S. 273 (1944) 15

United States v. Lombard,
102 F. 3d 1 (1st Cir. 1996) 17

United States v. Mercado,
474 F.3d 654 (9th Cir. 2007) 9

United States v. Pimental,
367 F. Supp. 2d 143 (D.Mass. 2005) 9

United States v. Reuter,
463 F. 3d 792 (7th Cir. 2006) 19

United States v. Watts,
519 U.S. 148 (1997) 10, 13, 19

United States v. White,
No. 05-6596 11

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS

U.S. Const. amend V 1

U.S. Const. amend VI 1

STATUTES

18 U.S.C. § 2 2

18 U.S.C. § 3551 13

18 U.S.C. § 3553(a) ..... *passim*

18 U.S.C. § 3553(a)(2)(A) 14, 22

18 U.S.C. § 3553(a)(6) 14

18 U.S.C. § 3553(a)(7) 14

18 U.S.C. § 3661 13

21 U.S.C. § 841(a)(1) and (b)(1)(B)(vii) 2

21 U.S.C. § 846 2

28 U.S.C. § 994(I)(1) 14

28 U.S.C. §1254 (1) 1

RULES

U.S.S.G. § 1B1.3 12

OTHER

S. Rep. No. 225, 98th Congress, 2d Session (1983), *reprinted in* 1984 U.S.C.C.A.N. 3182 14

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Petitioner prays that a Writ of Certiorari issue to review the Judgment of the United States Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit filed in this case on May 28, 2008 affirming Petitioner's conviction and sentence.

OPINION BELOW

The Opinion of the United States Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit is unpublished, but can be found at *United States v. Gonzalez,* USCA No. 07-13648-GG (11th Cir. May 28, 2008) and is attached in the Appendix.

STATEMENT OF JURISDICTION

Petitioner appealed from a final Judgment of conviction to the United States Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit. The Court of Appeals rendered its unpublished Opinion on May 28, 2008 affirming the Judgment of the district court entered on July 31, 2007, Hon. John E. Steele presiding. This Court has jurisdiction pursuant to Title 28, United States Code, §1254 (1).

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

United States Constitution, Fifth and Sixth Amendments.

> In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the state and district

> wherein the crime shall have been committed, which district shall have been previously ascertained by law, and to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusations; to be confronted with the witnesses against him; to compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor, and to have the assistance of counsel for his defense.

Statutory, 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a).

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

A. The Proceedings Below

On June 29, 2006, a Federal Grand Jury in the Middle District of Florida, Ft. Myers Division returned a Superseding Indictment charging defendants Carlos Gonzalez and Fidel Gonzalez and others in Count 1of Conspiracy to Possess 1000 marijuana plants with Intent to Distribute them in violation of 21 U.S.C. § 841(a)(1) and (b)(1)(B)(vii) and 21 U.S.C. § 846, and in Count 2 of Possession of 1000 marijuana plants with Intent to Distribute them in violation of 21 U.S.C. § 841(a)(1), (b)(1)(B)(vii) and 18 U.S.C. § 2. (D. E. 73).[1]

On March 13, 2007, a seven (7) day Jury Trial commenced.(D. E. 177).

---

[1] "D. E." refers to the U. S. District Court Docket Report Entry which is immediately followed by the Entry number and Page number when referring to a Transcript.

On March 22, 2007, the Jury returned a Verdicts of guilty on Count 1 and not guilty on Count 2 as to Fidel Gonzalez.(D. E.191).

On July 31, 2007, Fidel Gonzalez was sentenced to 120-months imprisonment,5-years Supervised Release, a Mandatory Assessment Fee of $100 and a Money Judgment of $1,290,000.(D. E. 225).

On August 10, 2007, Fidel Gonzalez filed a timely Notice of Appeal.(D. E. 231).

On May 28, 2008, the United States Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit affirmed Fidel Gonzalez's conviction and Sentence. (D. E. 257).

On July 16, 2008, Fidel Gonzalez timely filed a Petition for Rehearing.

On August 4, 2008, the Petition for Rehearing was Denied by the Eleventh Circuit.

B. <u>The Factual Background</u>

The government's conspiracy case rested almost entirely on the testimony of eight (8) cooperating witnesses who pled guilty to Count 1 or 2 of the Indictment. Marijuana plants were seized from the homes of the cooperating witnesses.[2] There was one photo, admitted over defense objection, of Carlos

---

[2] The cooperating witnesses were Armando Garcia, Osvaldo Alonso, Gilberto Perez, Ignacio Castillo, Jr., Ignacio Castillo, Sr., Jose Pupo, Jose Ruperto Gonzalez, Carlos Gonzalez Hernandez and Ernesto Castillo.

Andres Gonzalez standing next to some marijuana plants.

The prosecutor described the investigation as falling into four (4) distinct phases. Phase I was the arrest of Ernesto Castillo in Miami and his cooperation with State authorities. Phase II involved Ignacio Castillo and other persons who were arrested. Phase III involved Osvaldo Alonso and Gilberto Perez. And Phase IV involved both Fidel Gonzalez and Carlos Andres Gonzalez. (D. E. #204).

Much of the testimony at trial consisted of detectives describing the unfolding investigation from Miami [referencing Count-1, the Conspiracy charge] to Cape Coral [referencing Count-2, the substantive Possession charge] followed by evidence from the cooperating witnesses of their participation in the cultivation and distribution of marijuana plants.

As described in the prosecutor's opening statement, (D.E.# 204), in June 2004, Ernesto Castillo was arrested in Miami in connection with a marijuana grow house where 64 marijuana plants were found. He was charged with the cultivation of marijuana. In April 2005, he entered into a cooperation agreement with the State of Florida.

State authorities began an investigation into others who were growing marijuana in Miami-Dade County. Ernesto Castillo met with detectives in Cape Coral, Florida and drove around with them; identifying houses associated with the marijuana grow organization. He pointed out three houses where he had helped set up marijuana grow rooms.

Later that month, search warrants were executed on seven homes in the Cape Coral area, producing 622 marijuana plants in varying stages of development. Police arrested ten people listed in the footnote.[3]

After his arrest in Cape Coral, Ignacio Castillo also agreed to cooperate with law enforcement authorities. (D.E. #204:125). He named Fidel Gonzalez as the person who was responsible for placing people in the houses to grow marijuana. Fidel did not own any of the houses. (D.E.# 204:126). Ignacio Castillo owned four homes in the Cape Coral area.

Gilberto Perez was a friend of Carlos Andres Gonzalez in Cuba. He testified that Carlos Andres Gonzalez taught him how to cultivate marijuana plants and paid him to harvest by the pound. (D.E.# 205:347). He harvested 50-60 plants three times at a house in Carol City, Florida. (D.E.# 205:349).

Gilberto Perez incriminated Fidel Gonzalez in several respects. He testified that Fidel had knowledge of how to conduct a marijuana business, that he gave him money to buy the house, and that he brought people to the house to set up the indoor grow room. (D.E.# 205:353). Further, Fidel and Carlos helped him

---

[3] Ignacio Castillo (cousin of Ernesto Castillo) and his common law wife, Yusimi Hernandez; Carlos Gonzalez Hernandez (the uncle of Carlos Andres Gonzalez); Rafael Lopez (the brother-in-law of Ignacio Castillo); Jose Ruperto Gonzalez (the father of Carlos Andres Gonzalez); Arlenee Sanchez (the mother of Yusimi Hernandez); Ignacio Castillo, Sr. (the father of Ignacio Castillo); Hilga Castillo (the mother of Ignacio Castillo); Jose Pena Pupo; and Armando Garcia. (D.E.# 204:124).

set up a second grow operation in Homestead, Florida in 2003. (D.E.# 205:354).

The person who lived in the Homestead house was Carlos Andres Gonzalez's father Jose Ruperto Gonzalez. He became the caretaker of the plants there and harvested approximately 40 plants three times. (D.E.# 205:359-360). The Homestead house had a fourth harvest of 40 plants after Jose Gonzalez left and Jose Pupo took over. (D.E.# 205:365).

Perez sold the Homestead house and moved to Cape Coral in April 2004. (D.E.# 205:367). The new house was financed with money from Fidel and Carlos. Carlos Gonzalez brought people to set up the grow operation in the garage, where they planted 14 plants. (D.E.# 205:367-369). There was one harvest at this Cape Coral house. (D.E.# 205:371)

Jose Gonzalez testified that he took over in Homestead when Gilberto Perez left the Homestead house. He oversaw the cultivation of three crops that were successfully harvested. The three crops consisted of 60, 32, and 60 plants. (D.E.# 205:439). (D.E.# 205:443). Fidel Gonzalez controlled the money. (D.E.# 205:446). He also claimed that his son, co-Defendant Carlos Andres Gonzalez, was a partner with Fidel Gonzalez. (D.E.# 205:451)

Osvaldo Alonso testified that he spoke with Fidel Gonzalez about getting into the marijuana grow business. (D.E.# 206:613). Workers sent by Fidel came to his house to build a grow room; and he successfully harvested 66 plants at his house in Homestead. (D.E.# 206:619-620)

Alonso bought two houses in Cape Coral which were adapted for the indoor cultivation of marijuana. (D.E.# 207:634). Fidel Gonzalez made some initial payments to him; later he was paid by Carlos Andres Gonzalez, as Alonso had stopped working for Fidel. (D.E.# 207:640).

Carlos Gonzalez Hernandez, the uncle of Defendant Carlos Andres Gonzalez, testified that he took care of plants in Cape Coral. (D.E.# 207:726). He twice harvested 62 plants. (D.E.# 207:726). He testified that Fidel came with his nephew on one occasion to see the plants. (D.E.# 207:729). He did not know if Fidel Gonzalez was involved in the marijuana business. (D.E.# 207:730).

Ignacio Castillo grew marijuana plants in the garage of his house on (D.E.# 208:791). S.W. 122 Place. (D.E.# 208:776). Andy and Fidel taught him how to grow the plants. (D.E.# 208:777). He had three harvested crops of 54 or 55 plants each. (D.E.# 208:780). The harvesting was done by a group of people brought to the house by Fidel. (D.E.# 208:784). He also harvested three crops of 20, 26 or 27 and 30 plus plants in a house at 414 N.W. 19th Terrace in Cape Coral, Florida.[4] (D.E.# 208:791).

---

[4] There was another harvest of 17-20 plants at 2402 S.W. 32nd Street that did not involve Fidel. That business deal was between Ignacio and Carlos Andres Gonzalez. (D.E.# 208:797). Ignacio bought the houses in Cape Coral with his own money.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT

I. The provisions of the Sentencing Reform Act indicate that Congress did not intend that acquitted conduct should always be treated the same as convicted conduct.

II. The Sentence in this case, which was enhanced for acquitted conduct, is unreasonable because the District Court failed to Consider properly the statutory purposes in 18 U. S. C. § 3553(a).

Under the guise of "judicial discretion," there is a sentencing regime that allows the government to try its case not once but twice. The first time before a jury; the second before a judge.

Before the jury, the government must prove its case beyond a reasonable doubt. But if it loses on some counts, that matters little. Free of the Federal Rules of Evidence, most constitutionally-imposed procedures, and the burden of proving any critical facts beyond a reasonable doubt, the government gets the proverbial "second bite at the apple" during sentencing to essentially retry those counts on which it lost. With this second chance at success, the government almost always wins by needing only to prove its (lost) case to a judge by a preponderance of the evidence. See *McMillan v. Pennsylvania*, 477 U.S. 79, 91-92 (1986) (due process generally satisfied when Government proves a sentencing enhancement by a preponderance of the evidence). Permitting a judge to impose a sentence that reflects conduct the jury expressly disavowed through a finding of 'not guilty' amounts to more than mere second-guessing of the jury — it entirely trivializes its principal fact-finding function.

But no less significant, this judicial fact-finding deprives a defendant of adequate notice as to his or her possible sentence. This state of affairs is unfair, unjust and plain unconstitutional. Though the government might have "won" everyone and everything else — the defendant, the jury system, the Constitution —looses.

In the last decade, this Court has reaffirmed the jury's central role in the criminal justice system. See, e.g., *Apprendi v. New Jersey*, 530 U.S. 466 (2000); *Ring v. Arizona*, 536 U.S. 584 (2002); *Blakely v. Washington*, 542 U.S. 296 (2004); *United States v. Booker*, 543 U.S. 220 (2005). Rather than pretending as if these cases were never decided, federal judges should acknowledge their clear implication: A judge violates a defendant's Sixth Amendment rights by making findings of fact that either ignore or countermand those made by the jury and then relies on these factual findings to enhance the defendant's sentence. *Cf. United States v. Mercado*, 474 F.3d 654, 658 (9th Cir. 2007) (Fletcher, B., J., dissenting) ("Reliance on acquitted conduct in sentencing diminishes the jury's role and dramatically undermines the protections enshrined in the Sixth Amendment."); *United States v. Faust*, 456 F.3d 1342, 1349 (11th Cir. 2006) (Barkett, J., specially concurring) ("I strongly believe . . . . that sentence enhancements based on acquitted conduct are unconstitutional under the Sixth Amendment, as well as the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment."); *United States v. Ibanga*, 454 F. Supp. 2d 532, 536 (E.D. Va. 2006) (Kelley, J.) ("Sentencing a defendant to time in prison for a crime that the jury found he did not commit is a Kafka-esque result."); *United States v. Pimental*, 367 F. Supp. 2d 143, 153 (D.Mass. 2005) (Gertner, J.) ("To tout the importance of the jury in deciding facts, even traditional sentencing facts, and then to ignore the

fruits of its efforts makes no sense — as a matter of law or logic.").

In allowing the acquitted conduct by jury verdict to serve as a basis to enhance Fidel Gonzalez's sentence violates the Sixth Amendment and is unconstitutional. Further, that in doing so, demonstrates that a sentence based on acquitted conduct may well promote disrespect for the law, and thereby violate the statutory provision of 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a).

I. THE PROVISIONS OF THE SENTENCING REFORM ACT INDICATE THAT CONGRESS DID NOT INTEND THAT ACQUITTED CONDUCT SHOULD ALWAYS BE TREATED THE SAME AS CONVICTED CONDUCT.

Sentencing range enhancements based on facts alleged in charges of which a defendant has been acquitted ("acquitted conduct") have long been among the most controversial features of the Federal Sentencing Guidelines, in part because acquitted conduct enhancements effectively nullify the jury's determination in a criminal case. In *United States v. Watts,* 519 U.S. 148 (1997), the Supreme Court addressed this issue in a limited way when it held that consideration of acquitted conduct at sentencing does not violate the Double Jeopardy Clause. But now that more recent Supreme Court rulings have stressed the constitutional importance of jury determinations in the sentencing enterprise, the constitutionality of acquitted conduct enhancement under the Fifth and Sixth Amendments is questionable. In this Petition for Certiorari, Fidel Gonzalez argues in detail that acquitted conduct enhancements violate the Constitution.

In addition to any constitutional infirmities, acquitted conduct enhancements raise distinct statutory concerns. *United States v. Booker,* 543 U. S. 220 (2005), and its progeny stress that, because the Guidelines are now advisory, the directions that Congress set forth in the Sentencing Reform Act ("SRA"), and particularly the text of 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a), provide the ultimate instructions for sentencing decision-making by district and appellate courts. Acquitted conduct enhancements in some cases . . . especially when they significantly affect the applicable Guideline range and the ultimate sentence imposed . . . may deserve the statutory purposes of sentencing that Congress enumerated in 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a) and sought to vindicate in the SRA.

There currently exists a parallel pending cause reargued *En Banc* before the United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit styled *United States v. White,* No. 05-6596 from which the majority of the language and argument has been applied herein.

In the case at bar, Fidel Gonzalez's Base Offense Level under the Guidelines per Count-1should have been a sole independent function of the 916 marijuana plants [from the Miami marijuana harvest attributed to the Count-1 Conspiracy] per Paragraph 38 of the Presentence Report. As such, Fidel Gonzalez's Base Offense Level for 80-100 kilograms of marijuana would yield a Level 24. This number combined with the Leader/organizer 4 level adjustment yields a Total Offense Level of 28 in Criminal History Category I with a Guideline range of 78-97-months. However, and of serious note, is the stark issue that the government's pleadings in Count-1 of the Indictment reflect that Fidel Gonzalez was charged with

Conspiracy to Possess with Intent to Distribute "more than one thousand (1000) marijuana plants . . ." Even though trial counsel failed to proffer a Rule 29(a) F. R. Cr. P. Motion for Instructed Verdict of Acquittal; it should have been glaringly obvious to the district court that a *sua sponte* Motion for same was in order to protect both the defendant and the record. This was not done.

The district court failed to adequately examine whether the sentence complied with the SRA and, in particular, the statutory purposes of sentencing. Instead, the court reflexively treated acquitted conduct in the same way as convicted conduct without properly considering whether the enhancement would promote respect for the law and provide just punishment for the convicted offense. Fidel Gonzalez's conviction and sentence should, therefore, be vacated and remanded.

The relevant conduct Guideline promulgated by the Sentencing Commission, U.S.S.G. § 1B1.3, has generally been interpreted to require the treatment of acquitted conduct in exactly the same fashion as convicted conduct, no matter how much weaker the evidence (so long as it is proven by a preponderance of the evidence) or how factually and temporally distinct the conduct from the offense of conviction. However, the express text of the SRA indicates that Congress did not intend that result. "although Congress likely expected that judges would still have authority in a Guidelines system to consider some uncharged conduct at sentencing, the text and goals of the SRA suggest that Congress did not intend or seek that Guideline sentencing ranges would be automatically enhanced for conduct underlying offenses charged but formally rejected by a jury through an acquittal.

Both the Plain Text and the Legislative History of 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a) Indicate that Congress Intended Sentencing Judges to Focus Primarily upon Conduct for Which Defendants Have Been Found Guilty.

In *Watts,* this Court found that 18 U.S.C. § 3661 codified a "longstanding principle that sentencing courts have broad discretion to consider various kinds of information." *Watts,* 519 U. S. at 151. But while the language of § 3661 precludes a "blanket prohibition" on considering certain types of evidence at sentencing, other provisions indicate that Congress did not intend courts to rely on acquitted conduct in every case in exactly the same manner as convicted conduct. To the contrary, the precise text selected by Congress in the SRA – both in provisions directed at the Commission (in Title 28) and directed at courts (in Title 18) – indicates that sentences should be based principally on the offense for which a defendant is convicted, with at most limited case-by-case consideration of acquitted conduct.

The word "offense", which appears repeatedly in the SRA, was used by Congress as a specific reference to the offense of conviction. For example, 18 U.S.C. § 3551, which describes the scope of the SRA's provisions, tellingly refers only to defendants who have "been found guilty of an offense." Because being "found guilty" results in conviction, the phrasing here makes clear that the word "offense" refers to the **actual** offense of conviction. Moreover, in provisions directing how the Commission should punish multiple instances of criminal misconduct, Congress authorized incremental punishment only "in a case where a defendant is convicted of" multiple criminal offenses.

28 U.S.C. § 994(*l*)(1). See S. Rep. No. 225, 98th Congress, 2d Session at 176-77 (1983), reprinted in 1984 U.S.C.C.A.N. 3182, 3359-60 (reiterating that the Commission's Guidelines should reflect the appropriateness of imposing an incremental penalty for each of multiple offenses of which a defenant is "convicted".[5]

Furthermore, § 3553(a) repeatedly instructs judges to consider matters related to "the offense" in a manner that clearly refers to the offense of conviction. See 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a)(2)(A)(instructing judge to consider the need for the sentence to "reflect the seriousness of the offense" and to "provide just punishment for the offense"); *Id.* § 3553(a)(7) (instructing judges to consider need for restitution for "any victims of the offense"). Similarly, in this key statutory provision, Congress directed sentencing courts to concern themselves with a specific type of disparity– the "unwarranted" disparity that may arise for "defendants with similar records who have been found guilty of similar conduct." 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a)(6). Both the express text and overall structure of 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a) indicate that Congress intended and expected sentencing judges to be focused principally on

---

[5] In a revealing comment, the Senate Report advised that, "to the extent feasible, the sentences for each of the multiple offenses [should] be determined separately and the degree to which they should overlap be specified. Under this approach, if the conviction for one of the offenses is overturned, it will be unnecessary to recalculate the sentence." *Id.* at 176-77; 3359-60. The implication of this statement is that, for a defendant who has multiple offenses, if any individual conviction is overturned, that offense would automatically be excluded from the resulting sentencing re-calculation.

offenses of conviction. *Cf. United States v. Eurer*, 463 F. 3d 792, 793 (7th Cir. 2006)(suggesting that reference to "the offense" in § 3553(a) concerns "the [actual] offense of conviction").[6]

Thus, while congress may have authorized judges in individual cases to take acquitted conduct into account in a limited fashion, there are strong indications that it did not endorse or expect that Guideline calculations would rotely assign acquitted conduct the same significance and weight as convicted conduct.[7]

A Sentencing Enhancement Based on Acquitted conduct May Deserve the Statutoty Purposes of Punishment, and a District Court Must therefore Consider Carefully Such an

---

[6] In contrast to the SRA's references to defendants having "been found guilty" or being "convicted of" certain offenses, the text of the SRA has no direct references to acquitted conduct. Had Congress intended or sought for acquitted conduct to be a regular and integral component of Guideline calculations, it likely would have made clear this view by using phrases like "has committed" and "responsible for" instead of the chosen phrases of "been found guilty" and "convicted of". See *United States v. James*, 478 U.S. 597, 604 (1986); *Ford v. United States*, 273 U. S. 593, 611-12 (1927).

[7] This Court has instructed that statutory construction "should go in the direction of constitutional policy even though not commanded by it." *United States v. Johnson*, 323 U.S. 273, 276 (1944). As Judge Friendly explained, "the Constitution is itself a datum in the interpretation of a statute." Henry J. Friendly Benchmarks 210 (1967). Accordingly, to the extent that the meaning of "offense" is ambiguous, the appropriate course is to interpret the SRA in a way that furthers the central role of the jury in sentencing as required by *Apprendi*, *Blakely*, and *Booker*.

Enhancement in Light of the Requirements of 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a).

Courts must seriously consider the Defendant's Sentence in the light of 18 U. S. C. § 3553(a) factors which provide:

> (1) the nature and circumstances of the offense and the history and characteristics of the defendant;
> (2) the need for the sentence imposed –
>
> > (A) to reflect the seriousness of the offense, to promote respect for the law, and to provide just punishment for the offense;
> > (B) to afford adequate deterrence to criminal conduct;
> > (C) to protect the public from further crimes of the defendant; and
> > (D) to provide the defendant with needed educational or vocational training, medical care, or other correctional treatment in the most effective manner;

Booker makes these considerations critical now that the Guidelines are advisory; the statutory text is the chief governing standard set forth by Congress against which all sentences must be measured. And the purposes listed in subparagraph (a)(2)(A) – particularly "promot[ing] respect for the law" and "provid[ing] just punishment for the offense" – may be considerably undercut by a sentence based on a Guideline range enhanced for acquitted conduct.

A sentence based on acquitted conduct enhancements undermines the firmly established

public expectation that offenders are punished **only** for crimes of which they are convicted, and **not** for charges on which they are acquitted. Indeed, the notion that a defendant can be acquitted of serious charges against him, as here, and still be punished as if the jury had returned a conviction on those counts is, to all but lawyers schooled in the federal sentencing process, a shocking proposition. See *United States v. Lombard,* 102 F. 3d 1, 5 (1st Cir. 1996)(acknowledging that "as a matter of public perception and acceptance, [the use of acquitted conduct] can often invite disrespect for the sentencing process"); *United States v. Ibanga,* 454 F. Supp. 2d 532, 541 (E. D. Va. 2006)(commenting that use of acquitted conduct "'[drives] a wedge between the community's sense of appropriate punishment and the criminal sanction inflicted'". *United States v. Coleman,* 370 F. Supp. 2d 661, 671-73 & n. 14 (S. D. Ohio 2005)(noting that "consideration of acquitted conduct has a deleterious effect on the public's view of the criminal justice system [because a] layperson would undoubtedly be revolted by the idea"); and *United States v. Frias,* 39 F. 3d 391, 393 (2nd Cir. 1994)(Oakes, J., concurring)(calling acquitted conduct rulings a "jurisprudence reminiscent of *Allice in Wonderland.* As the Queen of Hearts might say, 'Acquittal first, sentence afterwards.'").

When considering whether a sentence "promote[s] respect for the law, "it is not sufficient for a district court (or an appellate court merely to assess and review a final Guideline range after an acquitted conduct enhancement to consider whether the raw total promotes respect for the law. Such a methodology – which the District Court followed in the case at bar – fails to capture the distinct harms that flow from heavy reliance on acquitted conduct enhancements (as

opposed to reliance on convicted or even uncharged conduct enhancements). Critically, enhancements that treat acquitted conduct exactly the same as convicted conduct, convey the deleterious message that acquittals are legally inconsequential; this message in turn promotes disrespect for the historic and esteemed role of juries in the American legal system. In addition to evaluating the sum-total Guideline range, a court needs specifically to consider whether the heavy reliance on acquitted conduct to arrive at that total helps promote, or detracts from, "respect for the law."

Reliance on acquitted conduct enhancements directly implicates the question whether such a sentence provides "just" punishment for the offense. First, it is questionable whether "just punishment" is achieved when acquitted conduct is "priced" exactly the same as convicted conduct, as is mandated by the Guidelines, without any discount to reflect the fact that a jury already rejected the charges. As a number of judges have observed, such treatment may violate basic fairness. See *United States v. Hunter,* 19 F. 3d 895, 898 (4th Cir. 1994)(Hall, J., concurring) (recognizing that "[a]s regards uncharged 'relevant conduct,' this pricing [at exactly the same level of severity as convicted conduct] is at best a poor policy choice; as regards charges on which the jury has acquitted the defendant, it is just wrong"); *United States v. Concepcion,* 983 F. 2d 369, 396 (2d Cir. 1992)(Newman, J., concurring)(observing that the Commission's decision to count acquitted conduct the same was "entirely unjustified"). Indeed the text of the SRA suggests a court can and should consider at sentencing the weight, quality, and ultimate persuasiveness to a jury of the evidence presented at trial. Circuit courts since *Booker* have indicated that a

sentencing court is free to take these factors into account in arriving at a fair sentence. See *United States v. Reuter,* 463 F. 3d 792, 793 (7th Cir. 2006)(Posner, J.)(recognizing that "[a] judge might reasonably conclude that a sentence based almost entirely on evidence that satisfied only the normal civil standard of proof would be unlikely to promote respect for the law or provide just punishment for the offense of conviction. That would be a judgment for the sentencing judge to make and we would uphold it so long as it was reasonable in the circumstances"); and *United States v. Dazey,* 403 F. 3d 1147, 1177 (10th Cir. 2005)(noting that "[d]istrict courts might reasonably take into consideration the strength of the evidence in support of sentencing enhancements, rather that (as in the pre-*Booker* world) looking solely to whether there was a preponderance of the evidence, and applying Guidelines specified enhancements accordingly").

Reliance on acquitted conduct enhancements to increase a sentence dramatically raises the question whether such a penalty can be fairly described as a sanction "for the offense," meaning the offense of conviction. The arguable justification for consideration of acquitted conduct at sentencing is that it reflects the "circumstances" of the offense of conviction, and it was this justification that prompted this Court to reject the Double Jeopardy challenge presented in *Watts* over a decade ago. But where a primary driver of the punishment is alleged conduct of which the defendant was acquitted, it is difficult to describe such a sentence fairly as punishment for the convicted offense.

For instance, in the case at bar, where a primary determinant of Fidel Gonzalez's sentence was the Cape Coral seizure of marijuana for which he was held

accountable, even though he was found **not** guilty of Count 2, the possession of marijuana charge based on that seizure. The reality is that Fidel Gonzalez is being sentenced for that charge, despite the jury's refusal to convict him based on the evidence presented at trial.

As highlighted above, the statutory text enacted by Congress in § 3553(a) indicates that a judge deciding whether to enhance a sentence based on acquitted conduct must consider carefully and with specificity whether the enhanced punishment will serve the purposes of sentencing set forth in the SRA. A requirement calling for additional reasoning to support a sentence based on acquitted conduct adds an important measure of accountability and legitimacy to the post-*Booker* sentencing system. Notably, in the recent ruling in *Rita v. United States*, 127 S. Ct. 2456 (2007), this Court emphasized the importance of a sentencing court's statement of reasons, especially as it related to promoting respect for the legal system: "The statute does call for the judge to 'state' his 'reasons.' And that requriement reflects sound judicial practice. Judicial decisions are reasoned decisions. Confidence in a judge's use of reason underlies the public's trust in the judicial institution. A public statement of those reasons helps provide the public with the assurance that creates that trust." *Id.* at 2468. Demanding a more detailed statement of reasons in cases involving significant consideration of acquitted conduct helps ensure that the federal sentencing system lives up to the "public's trust in the judicial institution." See *Gall v. United States*, 128 S. Ct. 586, 597 (2007)("[The sentencing judge] must adequately explain the chosen sentence to allow for meaningful appellate review and to promote the perception of fair sentencing.").

II. THE SENTENCE IN THIS CASE, WHICH WAS SIGNIFICANTLY ENHANCED FOR ACQUITTED CONDUCT, IS UNREASONABLE BECAUSE THE DISTRICT COURT FAILED TO CONSIDER PROPERLY THE STATUTORY PURPOSES IN 18 U. S. C. § 3553(A).

The district court's sentence in this case exemplifies both the danger of treating acquitted conduct the same as convicted conduct, and the importance of an explicit consideration and measure of the application of all the § 3553(a) facts. Fidel Gonzalez was acquitted on Count-2, the possession of marijuana charge, in the Superseding Indictment. While the jury rejected the evidence of Fidel Gonzalez's involvement n that offense, the court sentenced him as if he had committed it.

Despite the highly problematic nature of his enhancement – which gave full credit to an offense of which Fidel Gonzalez not only was acquitted, but which at most reflected his co-defendant's conduct – the district court provided only a terse statement of its reasons at sentencing. While the court adopted a broad view of the underlying facts to determine that the total sentence complied with § 3553(a), it did not independently consider whether an enhancement attributable to that acquitted conduct itself advanced the goals of § 3553(a); it simply grouped acquitted conduct and convicted conduct together to decide that a higher sentence based on the full tally of all the marijuana plants in **both** Superseding Indictment Counts was in order. Nor did the court explain why it decided to price the acquitted conduct at full value as if it were convicted conduct. As such, there is nothing in the court's decision that explains why the sentence

was "sufficient but not greater than necessary" to promote respect for the law and provide just punishment for the offense of conviction. See 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a)(2)(A).

A Guideline sentence should not be deemed reasonable where the Guideline range is calculated based part on acquitted conduct. More specifically in light of the facts of this case, because the sentencing court failed to evaluate fairly and explain in detail whether and how the specific enhancement based on acquitted conduct itself would advance the central objectives of sentencing, the court's sentencing decision in this case was procedurally unreasonable.

CONCLUSION

The use of acquitted conduct to enhance a sentence violates the Sixth Amendment and the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment of the Constitution and undermines the Notice requirement that is at the heart of any criminal proceedings wherein a defendant should have fair Notice to know the precise effect a jury's verdict will have on his punishment. It cannot possibly satisfy Due Process to permit the nullification of a jury's not guilty verdict, with respect to any given charge, by allowing a judge to thereafter use the same conduct underlying that charge to enhance a defendant's sentence. The tally of marijuana plants relative to the acquitted Count-2 were specifically used in the **total** tally of marijuana plants by the sentencing court in order to impermissibly satisfy the government's pleadings of the Count-1 Conspiracy involving over 1000 marijuana plants which resulted in Fidel Gonzalez's enhancement.

Accordingly, Fidel Gonzalez respectfully requests that the Petition for Writ of Certiorari be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

STEVEN JAY ROZAN
Counsel of Record
STEVEN JAY ROZAN & ASSOCIATES
SBN # 17357000
FED. ID. NO. 1136 [USDC/SDTX]
2777 ALLEN PARKWAY, 10TH FLOOR
HOUSTON, TEXAS 77019
TEL - 713/627-3608
FAX - 713/622-8777

Attorney for Petitioner

APPENDIX A

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

No. 07-13648

[Filed May 28, 2008]

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Plaintiff-Appellee,	)
versus	)
CARLOS ANDRES GONZALEZ, a.k.a. Andy, FIDEL GONZALEZ, Defendants-Appellants.	)

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Middle District of Florida

D. C. Docket No. 05-00119-CR-FTM-29-DNF

Before CARNES, BARKETT and PRYOR, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:

Carlos Gonzalez appeals his convictions for conspiracy to distribute more than 1000 marijuana plants, 21 U.S.C. §§ 841(a)(1), 841(b)(1)(A)(viii), 846, and possession with intent to distribute 100 or more

marijuana plants, 21 U.S.C. § 841(a)(1), (b)(1)(B)(vii), and Fidel Gonzalez appeals his conviction and sentence for conspiracy to distribute more than 1000 marijuana plants, 21 U.S.C. §§ 841(a)(1), 841(b)(1)(A)(viii), 846. Fidel and Carlos each challenge evidentiary rulings. Fidel also argues that there was a material variance between his indictment and the evidence at trial, insufficient evidence to support his conviction, and a sentencing error. We affirm.

I. BACKGROUND

Fidel and Carlos were involved in the cultivation, distribution, and sale of marijuana. Carlos lived in Miami with Gilberto Perez. Carlos trained Perez about the cultivation of marijuana plants and introduced Perez to Fidel. Perez harvested three crops, each containing 50 to 60 marijuana plants. Fidel and Carlos paid Perez based on the amount that Perez produced and retained "the balance" of the profits. Fidel and Carlos transported the marijuana to New York in 30-pound increments.

Perez later received money from Carlos and Fidel to purchase two homes in Homestead. Fidel helped convert the homes into greenhouses, and Fidel and Carlos delivered marijuana plants to the two locations. Perez and Carlos's father, Jose Hernandez, cultivated the plants and harvested three crops totaling 120 plants. Hernandez also assisted other growers in harvesting ten additional crops, three of which involved a total of 152 plants.

Perez introduced Carlos to Osvaldo Alonso, who later performed electrical work and installed air conditioning in the marijuana greenhouses. Alonso

purchased a house in Homestead that Fidel helped convert into a greenhouse in which Alonso harvested two crops totaling 132 marijuana plants. Fidel, who observed the first harvest and took possession of the crop, divided the profit with Alonso. With profits from the first house, Alonso purchased a second home, where he harvested two additional crops totaling 132 marijuana plants. Fidel and Carlos took possession of the marijuana, and Carlos paid Alonso for the crops.

In the meantime, Carlos recruited Ignacio Carbajal in Miami and introduced him to Fidel. Carbajal purchased a home that Fidel and Carlos helped him to convert into a marijuana greenhouse. Carbajal harvested two crops totaling 108 plants and divided the profits with Carlos. Fidel transported Carbajal to assist others periodically to harvest their marijuana crops.

Carbajal introduced Carlos to his cousin, Ernesto Castillo, who cultivated the marijuana in Carbajal's Miami home and helped harvest marijuana at two other Miami greenhouses. At one harvest, Castillo saw Fidel and Carlos overseeing the operation. When Castillo inquired when he would paid for the harvests, Carbajal and his father told Castillo that Fidel controlled the money in the marijuana operation.

After several crops were stolen from the Miami homes, Carlos and Fidel moved their operations to Cape Coral, where they continued to provide money for individuals in the marijuana network to purchase and convert homes into marijuana greenhouses. The Gonzalezes assisted Perez to purchase a home that Perez used to harvest 14 marijuana plants. Carlos provided Carbajal with money to purchase one Cape

Coral home, in which he harvested three crops totaling 76 plants. Carlos then assisted Carbajal to purchase a second home, where Carbajal harvested 21 plants. Carlos helped Carbajal's father purchase a home in which Fidel helped to harvest 15 to 17 plants. Carlos also opened his home to Jose Pena Pupo, whom Carlos paid to harvest between 115 and 120 plants.

Carlos recruited Armando Garcia in Cape Coral and used Alonso to convert Garcia's house into a marijuana greenhouse. Garcia harvested between 40 and 50 marijuana plants, after which Carlos collected the substance and paid Garcia 24,000 dollars. Garcia thereafter assisted others to harvest four or five crops.

Carlos also recruited his uncle, Carlos Hernandez, to participate in two harvests totaling 124 plants. Fidel visited Hernandez on one occasion to observe the marijuana. Perez and Carbajal also visited Hernandez to advise him about growing marijuana.

After Ernesto Castillo was arrested in Carbajal's home, Fidel and Carlos provided Castillo with money to hire an attorney. Castillo eventually agreed to assist law enforcement to discover marijuana greenhouses in Miami. Castillo later expressed an interest in assisting authorities in Cape Coral. Castillo identified four homes that he had helped convert into greenhouses. Authorities placed a global positioning tracker on Carbajal's vehicle and tracked the vehicle to several other homes in Cape Coral.

Based on information accumulated during the investigation, Cape Coral officers and Drug Enforcement Administration agents executed warrants on seven homes visited by Carbajal and seized 691

marijuana plants. Although neither Fidel nor Carlos was arrested, their names were discovered in the contact lists of seized cellular telephones, and several individuals, including Armando Garcia, were taken into custody. When the authorities searched Garcia's house, they discovered a photograph of Carlos standing in what appeared to be a room of marijuana plants. Authorities later arrested Gilberto Perez and Osvaldo Alonso, and they agreed to cooperate in the investigation.

Fidel and Carlos were indicted for conspiracy to distribute more than 1000 marijuana plants, 21 U.S.C. §§ 841(a)(1), 841(b)(1)(A)(viii), 846, and possession with intent to distribute 1000 or more marijuana plants, 21 U.S.C. § 841(a)(1), (b)(1)(B)(vii). Before trial, Carlos filed a motion in limine to exclude the photograph seized from Garcia's house. The district court withheld a ruling until after the government laid a foundation for the evidence.

At trial, Gilberto Perez, Jose Hernandez, Armando Garcia, Osvaldo Alonso, Carlos Hernandez, Ignacio Carbajal, Jose Pupo, and Ernesto Castillo testified about their participation in the cultivation and harvesting of marijuana and their interaction with Fidel and Carlos. Jose Hernandez testified that Fidel "controlled the money" in the marijuana operation. Garcia testified that the photograph seized from his home depicted Carlos standing among marijuana "plants that look like the ones that I had in my house."

On cross-examination, Castillo denied that he had told police that Carbajal led the marijuana operation in Cape Coral. The government continued this line of inquiry on redirect examination and asked Castillo to

name the leader of the marijuana organization, to which Castillo answered that he did not know. The government then asked Castillo who he "believed" was the leader of the organization. Fidel objected and argued that the question had been "asked and answered" and that Castillo's opinion was "irrelevant." The district court overruled the objections, and Castillo answered that the leader was "[p]ossibly Fidel."

The jury found Fidel guilty of conspiracy to distribute more than 1000 marijuana plants. The jury found Carlos guilty of both the conspiracy crime and possession with intent to distribute more than 100 marijuana plants. The jury also made specific findings about the quantity of marijuana involved in Fidel's and Carlos's crimes.

Before sentencing, Fidel objected to the presentence investigation report and argued that, because he was acquitted on the possession charge, the marijuana seized in Cape Coral should not be included in the calculation of his sentence. Fidel also objected to his base offense level. Fidel reasserted these objections at sentencing. The district court overruled the objections and stated that the jury found beyond a reasonable doubt that Fidel was guilty of a conspiracy that involved more than 1000 marijuana plants. The district court sentenced both Fidel and Carlos to 120 months of imprisonment and five years of supervised release.

II. STANDARD OF REVIEW

We apply four standards of review in this appeal. We review evidentiary rulings for an abuse of discretion. United States v. Kennard, 472 F.3d 851,

854 (11th Cir. 2006), cert. denied, 127 S. Ct. 3004 (2007). We review de novo challenges to the sufficiency of the evidence and view the evidence in the light most favorable to the government. United States v. Futrell, 209 F.3d 1286, 1288 (11th Cir. 2000). We also review de novo the application of the sentencing guidelines and examine related findings of fact for clear error. United States v. Humber, 255 F.3d 1308, 1311 (11th Cir. 2001). Objections or arguments that are not raised in the district court are reviewed for plain error. United States v. Edouard, 485 F.3d 1324, 1343 (11th Cir. 2007); United States v. Evans, 478 F.3d 1332, 1338 (11th Cir.), cert. denied, 128 S. Ct. 257 (2007); United States v. Dennis, 237 F.3d 1295, 1300 (11th Cir. 2001); United States v. Harness, 180 F.3d 1232, 1234 (11th Cir. 1999).

III. DISCUSSION

Carlos and Fidel Gonzalez raise five separate issues for our consideration. All fail. We address each argument in turn.

A. The Photograph of Carlos Gonzalez Was Admissible.

Carlos argues that the district court erroneously admitted into evidence a photograph that depicted him surrounded by marijuana plants. He contends that the government did not authenticate the photograph and it was unduly prejudicial. We disagree.

The district court did not abuse its broad discretion by admitting the photograph into evidence. Testimony from Armando Garcia that Carlos was featured in the photograph and standing among what appeared to be

marijuana plants provided sufficient information to authenticate the photograph. See Fed. R. Evid. 901(a), (b)(1). Garcia's lack of knowledge about the photographer and the date of the photograph did not affect its admissibility. See United States v. Clayton, 643 F.2d 1071, 1074 (5th Cir. Unit B 1981). The probative value of the photograph outweighed any prejudice created by its admission because it provided physical evidence of Carlos's involvement in the marijuana conspiracy and his actual possession of marijuana. See United States v. Tinoco, 304 F.3d 1088, 1120 (11th Cir. 2002).

B. Testimony Regarding Fidel's Leadership Was Admissible.

Fidel argues, for the first time on appeal, that the district court should have excluded testimony from Ernesto Castillo that Fidel was "possibly" the leader of the conspiracy because the government did not establish that Castillo possessed firsthand knowledge of the matter. This argument fails. Castillo testified that he "knew" Fidel and Carlos, he observed them at a marijuana harvest, he received money from Fidel and Carlos to hire a defense attorney, and his cousin told him that Fidel controlled payment of workers in the marijuana harvesting business. See Fed. R. Evid. 602. Based on Castillo's cumulative knowledge about the conspiracy, the admission of Castillo's testimony did not prejudice Fidel's substantial rights. See United States v. Moriarty, 429 F.3d 1012, 1019 (11th Cir. 2005).

C. There Was No Variance Between Fidel's Indictment and the Evidence Introduced At Trial.

We review an argument of material variance viewing the evidence in the light most favorable to the government to determine whether a reasonable trier of fact could have found that a single conspiracy existed beyond a reasonable doubt. United States v. Castro, 89 F.3d 1443, 1450 (11th Cir. 1996). When an argument of material variance is raised for the first time on appeal, we review for plain error. United States v. Dennis, 237 F.3d 1295, 1300 (11th Cir. 2001). To be reversible error, the facts proved at trial must materially differ from the facts alleged in the indictment and the defendant must suffer substantial prejudice as a result. United States v. Weissman, 899 F.2d 1111, 1114 (11th Cir. 1990).

Fidel's argument that a material variance existed fails. The government introduced evidence that was consistent with the conspiracy charged in Fidel's indictment. Fidel and Carlos were charged with "knowingly and willfully combin[ing], conspir[ing], confederat[ing] and agree[ing] with each other and with other persons . . . to possess with intent to distribute more than one thousand (1000) marijuana plants" beginning in "September 2001, through and including May 17, 2005." Testimony presented by numerous government witnesses established that Fidel and Carlos acted jointly to recruit and assist individuals to purchase and convert houses in Homestead, Miami, and Cape Coral into indoor marijuana greenhouses, to cultivate and harvest over 1000 marijuana plants, and to sell the marijuana.

D. Sufficient Evidence Supports Fidel's Conviction.

Fidel argues, for the first time on appeal, that there was insufficient evidence to prove he conspired to distribute more than 1000 marijuana plants, but this argument fails. When a defendant fails to move for a judgment of acquittal, we will affirm his conviction unless "the evidence on a key element of the offense is so tenuous that a conviction would be shocking." United States v. Bischel, 156 F.3d 1148, 1150 (11th Cir. 1998). Testimony from Gilberto Perez, Jose Hernandez, Osvaldo Alonso, Carlos Hernandez, and Ignacio Carbajal established that Fidel assisted in the cultivation of over 1000 marijuana plants in homes located in Homestead, Miami, and Cape Coral.

E. Fidel Was Correctly Sentenced For Conspiring to Distribute More Than 1000 Marijuana Plants.

Fidel argues that his sentence was improperly enhanced for his involvement with more than 1000 marijuana plants because witnesses did not distinguish marijuana seedlings from marijuana plants. His argument fails. Testimony supports the finding by the jury that Fidel conspired to distribute more than 1000 marijuana plants.

IV. CONCLUSION

The convictions of Carlos Gonzalez and the conviction and sentence of Fidel Gonzalez are **AFFIRMED.**

APPENDIX B

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA
FT. MYERS DIVISION

No.: 2:05-cr-119-FtM-29DNF

USM No.: 79182-004

[Filed July 31, 2007]

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	)
	)
-vs-	)
	)
FIDEL GONZALEZ	)
	)

Rene A. Sotorrio, Esq., Retained
800 Douglas Road, Suite 219
Coral Gables, Florida 33134

JUDGMENT IN A CRIMINAL CASE

The defendant was found guilty on Counts One of the Superseding Indictment. Accordingly, the court has adjudicated that the defendant is guilty of the following offense(s):

Title & Section	Nature of Offense	Date Offense Concluded	Count Number(s)
21 U.S.C.§§ 841(a)(1), 841(b)(1)(A)(vii), 846	Conspiracy to Possess with Intent to Distribute More than One Thousand Marijuana Plants	May 17, 2005	One

The defendant is sentenced as provided in the following pages of this judgment. The sentence is imposed pursuant to the Sentencing Reform Act of 1984, as modified by United States v. Booker, 125 S. Ct. 738 (2005).

Original Indictment dismissed on the motion of the United States.

IT IS ORDERED that the defendant shall notify the United States attorney for this district within 30 days of any change of name, residence, or mailing address until all fines, restitution, costs and special assessments imposed by this judgment are fully paid. If ordered to pay restitution, the defendant shall notify the court and United States attorney of any material change in the defendant's economic circumstances.

Date of Imposition of Sentence:

July 31, 2007

/s/ John E. Steele
JOHN E. STEELE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

July 31, 2007

IMPRISONMENT

The defendant is hereby committed to the custody of the United States Bureau of Prisons to be imprisoned for a term of 120 Months as to Count One.

The Court recommends to the Bureau of Prisons:

1. Participation in the Institution Hearing Program with the Fedearl Bureau of Prisions to determine the defendant's removal status while incarcerated.

2. Incarceration in a facility close to home (Miami, Florida).

The defendant is remanded to the custody of the United States Marshal.

RETURN

I have executed this judgment as follows:

_____

_____

Defendant delivered on _____ to _____ at , _____, with a certified copy of this judgment.

_____
UNITED STATES MARSHAL

By: _____
Deputy U.S. Marshal

SUPERVISED RELEASE

Upon release from imprisonment, the defendant shall be on supervised release for a term of **Five (5) years**.

The defendant shall report to the probation office in the district to which the defendant is released within 72 hours of release from custody of the Bureau of Prisons.

The defendant shall not commit another federal, state or local crime.

The defendant shall not illegally possess a controlled substance.

For offenses committed on or after September 13, 1994:

The defendant shall refrain from any unlawful use of a controlled substance. The defendant shall submit to one drug test within 15 days of release from imprisonment and at least two periodic drug tests thereafter.

The defendant shall not possess a firearm, destructive device, or any other dangerous weapon.

If this judgment imposes a fine or a restitution obligation, it shall be a condition of supervision that the defendant pay any such fine or restitution that remains unpaid at the commencement of the term of supervision in accordance with the Schedule of Payments set forth in the Criminal Monetary Penalties sheet of this judgment.

The defendant shall comply with the standard conditions that have been adopted by this court (set forth below). The defendant shall also comply with the additional conditions on the attached page.

STANDARD CONDITIONS OF SUPERVISION

1. The defendant shall not leave the judicial district without the permission of the court or probation officer;

2. The defendant shall report to the probation officer and shall submit a truthful and complete written report within the first five days of each month;

3. The defendant shall answer truthfully all inquiries by the probation officer and follow the instructions of the probation officer;

4. The defendant shall support his or her dependents and meet other family responsibilities;

5. The defendant shall work regularly at a lawful occupation, unless excused by the probation officer for schooling, training, or other acceptable reasons;

6. The defendant shall notify the probation officer **at least ten (10) days prior** to any change in residence or employment;

7. The defendant shall refrain from excessive use of alcohol and shall not purchase, possess, use, distribute, or administer any controlled substance or any paraphernalia related to any controlled substances, except as prescribed by a physician;

8. The defendant shall not frequent places where controlled substances are illegally sold, used, distributed, or administered;

9. The defendant shall not associate with any persons engaged in criminal activity and shall not associate with any person convicted of a

felony, unless granted permission to do so by the probation officer;

10. The defendant shall permit a probation officer to visit him or her at any time at home or elsewhere and shall permit confiscation of any contraband observed in plain view by the probation officer;

11. The defendant shall notify the probation officer within **seventy-two (72) hours** of being arrested or questioned by a law enforcement officer;

12. The defendant shall not enter into any agreement to act as an informer or a special agent of a law enforcement agency without the permission of the court;

13. As directed by the probation officer, the defendant shall notify third parties of risks that may be occasioned by the defendant's criminal record or personal history or characteristics, and shall permit the probation officer to make such notifications and to confirm the defendant's compliance with such notification requirement.

ADDITIONAL CONDITIONS OF SUPERVISED RELEASE

The defendant shall also comply with the following additional conditions of supervised release:

1. The defendant shall provide the Probation Officer access to any requested financial information.

2. If the defendant's removal status is not resolved while he is incarcerated, then pursuant to 18 U.S.C. §3583(d), the defendant is to be delivered, upon release from imprisonment, to a duly authorized immigration official to determine if removal is appropriate. Should removal be ordered, the defendant is to remain outside the United States, unless authorized by the Secretary for the Departmnet of Homeland Security or the appropriate immigration authority.

3. Having been convicted of a qualifying felony offense, the defendant shall cooperate with the Probation Office in the collection of DNA, if not already collected by the Bureau of Prisons.

4. The defendant shall refrain from any unlawful use of a controlled substance, and shall submit to one drug test within 15 days of placement on supervised release and a least two periodic drug tests thereafter as directed by the probation officer. Based on the Court's determination that additional drug urinalysis is necessary, the Court authorizes random drug testing not to exceed 104 tests per year.

CRIMINAL MONETARY PENALTIES

The defendant shall pay the following total criminal monetary penalties in accordance with the schedule of payments set forth in the Schedule of Payments.

Total Assessment	Total Fine	Total Restitution
$100.00	Waived	N/A

The defendant shall pay interest on any fine or restitution of more than $2,500, unless the fine or restitution is paid in full before the fifteenth day after the date of the judgment, pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3612(f). All of the payment options on the Schedule of Payments may be subject to penalties for delinquency and default, pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3612(g).

Other:*Findings for the total amount of losses are required under Chapters 109A, 110, 110A, and 113A of Title 18, United States Code, for offenses committed on or after September 13, 1994 but before April 23, 1996.

SCHEDULE OF PAYMENTS

Having assessed the defendant's ability to pay, payment of the total criminal monetary penalties shall be due as follows:

Unless the court has expressly ordered otherwise in the special instructions above, if this judgment imposes a period of imprisonment, payment of criminal monetary penalties shall be due during the period of imprisonment. All criminal monetary penalties, except those payments made through the Federal Bureau of Prisons' Inmate Financial Responsibility Program, are made to the clerk of the court, unless otherwise directed by the court, the probation officer, or the United States attorney.

The defendant shall receive credit for all payments previously made toward any criminal monetary penalties imposed.

It is **further ordered** that the defendant shall forfeit to the United States as follows:

Money Judgment in the amount of $1,290,000.00, jointly and severally with the co-defendant, Carlos Andres Gonzalez.

Payments shall be applied in the following order: (1) assessment, (2) restitution principal, (3) restitution interest, (4) fine principal, (5) community restitution, (6) fine interest (7) penalties, and (8) costs, including cost of prosecution and court costs.

APPENDIX C

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

No. 07-13648-GG

[Filed August 4, 2008]

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Plaintiff-Appellee,	)
versus	)
CARLOS ANDRES GONZALEZ, a.k.a. Andy, FIDEL GONZALEZ, Defendants-Appellants.	)

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Middle District of Florida

Before CARNES, BARKETT and PRYOR, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:

The *pro se* petition(s) for rehearing filed by Appellant Fidel Gonzalez is DENIED.

ENTERED FOR THE COURT:

/s/
UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE

ORD-41

OCT 29,2008 09:32
U S GOVERNMENT
404 335 6250

APPENDIX D

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA
FORT MYERS DIVISION

NO. 2:05-cr-119-FtM-29DNF
21:841(a)(1)
21:841(b)(1)(A)(vii)
21:841(b)(1)(B)(vii)
21:846 (Conspiracy)
21:853 (Forfeiture)
18:2

[Filed June 29, 2006]

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	)
	)
v.	)
	)
CARLOS ANDRES GONZALEZ,	)
a/k/a "Andy", and	)
FIDEL GONZALEZ,	)
a/k/a "Fidelito"	)
	)

SUPERSEDING INDICTMENT

The Grand Jury charges:

COUNT ONE

From a date unknown, but at least by in or about September 2001, through and including May 17, 2005, in Lee County, in the Middle District of Florida and elsewhere,

CARLOS ANDRES GONZALEZ
a/k/a/ "Andy", and
FIDEL GONZALEZ,
a/k/a "Fidelito",

the defendants herein, did knowingly and willfully combine, conspire, confederate and agree with each other and with other persons known and unknown to the Grand Jury, to possess with intent to distribute more than one thousand (1000) marijuana plants, a Schedule I Controlled Substance, in violation of Title 21, United States Code, Sections 841(a)(1) and 841(b)(1)(A)(vii).

All in violation of Title 21, United States Code, Section 846.

COUNT TWO

On or about May 17, 2005, in Lee County, in the Middle District of Florida,

CARLOS ANDRES GONZALEZ
a/k/a "Andy", and
FIDEL GONZALEZ
a/k/a "Fidelito",

the defendants herein, did knowingly and willfully possess and aid and abet the possession of, with intent

to distribute, more than one hundred (100) marijuana plants, a Schedule I Controlled Substance, in violation of Title 21, United States Code, Sections 841(a)(1), 841(b)(1)(B)(vii) and Title 18, United States Code, Section 2.

FORFEITURES

1. The allegations contained in Counts One and Two of this Superseding Indictment are hereby realleged and incorporated by reference for the purpose of alleging forfeitures pursuant to the provision of Title 21, United States Code, Section 853.

2. From their engagement in the violations alleged in Counts One and Two of this Superseding Indictment, punishable by imprisonment for more than one year, the defendants,

CARLOS ANDRES GONZALEZ
a/k/a "Andy", and
FIDEL GONZALEZ,
a/k/a "Fidelito",

shall forfeit to the United States of America, pursuant to Title 21, United States Code, Section 853(a)(1) and (2), all of their interest in:

a. Property constituting, or derived from, any proceeds the defendants obtained, directly or indirectly, as a result of such violations; and

b. Property used, or intended to be used, in any manner or part, to commit, or to facilitate the commission of, such violations.

Said property, interests, claims, and contractual rights to include, but are not limited to, the following: Intangible property and real property, including all improvements thereon and appurtenances thereto, described as follows:

1. **1927 SE 17th Place, Cape Coral, Florida,** also known as Cape Coral Unit 89, Blk 5382, PB 23, PG 158, Lots 35 & 36, owner of record New Millennia Corporation;

3. If any of the property described above, as a result of any act or omission of the defendants:

a. cannot be located upon the exercise of due diligence;

b. has been transferred or sold to, or deposited with, a third party;

c. has been placed beyond the jurisdiction of the court;

d. has been substantially diminished in value; or

e. has been commingled with other property which cannot be divided without difficulty,

the United States of America shall be entitled to forfeiture of substitute property under the provision of Title 21, United States Code, Section 853(p).

Dated: 6/29/2006 A TRUE BILL,

/s/
Foreperson

PAUL I. PEREZ
United States Attorney

By: /s/ Jesus M. Casas
Jesus M. Casas
Assistant United States Attorney
Trial Counsel

By. /s/ Yolanda G. Viacava
Yolanda G. Viacava
Assistant United States Attorney
Asset Forfeiture Attorney

By: /s/ Douglas Malloy
Douglas Molloy
Assistant United States Attorney
Chief, Fort Myers Division

FORM OED-34
APR 1991

No.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
Middle District of Florida
Fort Myers Division

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

vs.

CARLOS ANDRES GONZALEZ
a/k/a "Andy", and
FIDEL GONZALEZ,
a/k/a "Fidelito"

SUPERSEDING INDICTMENT

Violations:

21 U.S.C. §§ 841(a)(1), 841(b)(1)(A)(vii), 841(b)(1)(B)(vii), 846, 853(forfeiture), and 18 U.S.C. §2

A true bill.

/s/_____
Foreperson

Filed in open court this 29th day
of June, A.D. 2006.

_____
Clerk

Bail $_____

APPENDIX E

U.S. Const. amend. V

No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a grand jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the militia, when in actual service in time of war or public danger; nor shall any person be subject for the same offense to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb; nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself, nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation.

U.S. Const. amend. VI

In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the state and district wherein the crime shall have been committed, which district shall have been previously ascertained by law, and to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation; to be confronted with the witnesses against him; to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor, and to have the assistance of counsel for his defense.

United States Code
Title 18. Crimes and Criminal Procedure
Part II. Criminal Procedure
Chapter 227. Sentences
Subchapter A. General Provisions

18 U.S.C. § 3553. Imposition of a sentence

(a) Factors to be considered in imposing a sentence.--The court shall impose a sentence sufficient, but not greater than necessary, to comply with the purposes set forth in paragraph (2) of this subsection. The court, in determining the particular sentence to be imposed, shall consider--

(1) the nature and circumstances of the offense and the history and characteristics of the defendant;

(2) the need for the sentence imposed--

(A) to reflect the seriousness of the offense, to promote respect for the law, and to provide just punishment for the offense;

(B) to afford adequate deterrence to criminal conduct;

(C) to protect the public from further crimes of the defendant; and

(D) to provide the defendant with needed educational or vocational training, medical care, or other correctional treatment in the most effective manner;

(3) the kinds of sentences available;

(4) the kinds of sentence and the sentencing range established for--

(A) the applicable category of offense committed by the applicable category of defendant as set forth in the guidelines--

(i) issued by the Sentencing Commission pursuant to section 994(a)(1) of title 28, United States Code, subject to any amendments made to such guidelines by act of Congress (regardless of whether such amendments have yet to be incorporated by the Sentencing Commission into amendments issued under section 994(p) of title 28); and

(ii) that, except as provided in section 3742(g), are in effect on the date the defendant is sentenced; or

(B) in the case of a violation of probation or supervised release, the applicable guidelines or policy statements issued by the Sentencing Commission pursuant to section 994(a)(3) of title 28, United States Code, taking into account any amendments made to such guidelines or policy statements by act of Congress (regardless of whether such amendments have yet to be incorporated by the Sentencing Commission into amendments issued under section 994(p) of title 28);

(5) any pertinent policy statement--

(A) issued by the Sentencing Commission pursuant to section 994(a)(2) of title 28, United

States Code, subject to any amendments made to such policy statement by act of Congress (regardless of whether such amendments have yet to be incorporated by the Sentencing Commission into amendments issued under section 994(p) of title 28); and

(B) that, except as provided in section 3742(g), is in effect on the date the defendant is sentenced.

(6) the need to avoid unwarranted sentence disparities among defendants with similar records who have been found guilty of similar conduct; and

(7) the need to provide restitution to any victims of the offense.

* * *